

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,658	01/29/2004	Masaki Okamoto	36409	5389
PEARNE & GORDON LLP 1801 EAST 9TH STREET			EXAMINER	
			PATEL, SHAMBHAVI K	
SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2128	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1 8	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	10/767,658	OKAMOTO ET AL.	OKAMOTO ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
·	Shambhavi Patel	2128		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE T				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to a this application, applicant must timely file one of the places the application in condition for allowance; (2) (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in confollowing time periods:</li> </ol>	or on the same day as filing a N following replies: (1) an amend a Notice of Appeal (with appeal ompliance with 37 CFR 1.114. T	otice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment nent, affidavit, or other evidence, which fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; of		
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) o MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN 07(f).	g date of the final rejection. THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TW	<b>VO</b>	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensi CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortene above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	ion and the corresponding amount of ed statutory period for reply originally s	the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 et in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	7	
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in confiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or an Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply much AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	ny extension thereof (37 CFR 4	I.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appea	ate I.	
<ul> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final reject         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require furthe</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or</li> <li>(d) They present additional claims without cancelin NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	er consideration and/or search ( below); n better form for appeal by mate ng a corresponding number of fi	rially reducing or simplifying the issues	for	
<ul> <li>4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFF</li> <li>5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection</li> </ul>		Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324	·).	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment cancelin	ng	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		)  will be entered and an explanation	of	
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final actio because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e)</li> </ol>	d and sufficient reasons why the	e affidavit or other evidence is necessary	∍d /	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of feentered because the affidavit or other evidence failed showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is nece</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explar</li> </ol>	to overcome <u>all</u> rejections undessary and was not earlier prese	er appeal and/or appellant fails to providented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).	e a	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered.			e.	
See Continuation Sheet.  12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			<b>ن.</b> ب	
13. Other:			,	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant submits that Sarvar et al. does not teach "executing a simulation based on a first condition selected for a first step; selecting a simulated result from the first simulation executing step as a simulation condition for a second step; and executing a simulation of the second step based on a second condition, wherein the second condition contains at least the simulation condition" because Sarvar only simulates a peak temperature based on empirically obtained varying specific heat capacities. The Examiner notes that the "empirically obtained varying specific heat capacities" in Sarvar are first simulated, and based on this the temperatures can be simulated. See for example, the 3rd paragraph in "Modeling Variable Materials Data" which discloses modeling the variable behavior of C(p) (so that it may be simulated), and then simulating the change in temperature ("Modeling of an Exemplary Product and Process Combination"). The Applicant is further directed to "3) Density, Emissivity, and Conductivity Values" which discloses modeling the sensitivity of simulated peak temperatures to variations in emissivity. Applicant submits that Sarvar does not disclose a condition table. Applicant is directed to Table III, which models the effect of variation in heat capacity (first simulated condition) on change in temperature (second simulated condition). The 101 rejection is maintained, because while a simulation result is obtained, this is not necessarily a real world result, and may be interpreted to be abstract in nature as, for example, a thought, a computation, or manipulated data

KAMINI SHAH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER